UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,560	02/17/2006	Manfred Hornke	F7730(V)	6503
	7590 03/03/200 ATENT GROUP	EXAMINER		
800 SYLVAN		MCKINLEY, CHRISTOPHER BRIAN		
AG West S. Wi ENGLEWOOD	ng CLIFFS, NJ 07632-31	100	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	·		3781	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/568,560	HORNKE ET AL.					
			Examiner	Art Unit				
			CHRISTOPHER B. MCKINLEY	3781				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communi or Reply	ication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ac	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MANSIONS OF THE MANSIO	AILING DA of 37 CFR 1.136 unication. ututory period will will, by statute, c	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO (a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this o ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <i>18 Dec</i>	cember 2008.					
			action is non-final.					
′=	, — · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
<i>/</i> —	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)🛛	Claim(s) 1,5-7 and 9 is/are pending i	n the applic	ation.					
·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1,5-7 and 9</u> is/are rejected.							
· ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restric	tion and/or	election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner						
-				Examiner.				
7-7	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including				FR 1.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to			-	, ,			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) 🗆	Acknowledgment is made of a claim f	for foreign p	oriority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
· .	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	0 1	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, , , , ,				
,-	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	t(s)							
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary					
2) Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P	TO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	-алент Аррисатоп				

Art Unit: 3781

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1, 5-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the plane" in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chamourian (4,886,184) in view of Amberg (3,179,283). Chamourian discloses the limitations of the claims including a thermoplastic (Abstract) container lid (figs. 1-6) suitable for use with a cover foil (col. 1, line 9) comprising a body (12), skirt (24), rim (20) with recess (fig. 4), mirror (14), outer part (portion of body 1 outside said rim and adjacent skirt 24), wherein said rim has two bridge part indentations (18, 22). Chamourian excludes what Amberg teaches, bridges (fig. 3, space separating

Art Unit: 3781

segmented annular rim 17a) thereby utilizing less material. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Chamourian with bridges in order to connect said mirror and outer part, provide a break in said rim and utilize less material thereby reducing production cost.

Chamourian excludes what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, disposing said indentations at negative angles at a place where there is no bridge in order to facilitate design choice and to create an ergonomic gripping handle for lid removal. Moreover, a change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as described in par. 5 The references as described in par. 5 disclose the limitations of the claims excluding what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, having 6 or more bridges in order to facilitate design choice and having bridges with a width of 3 mm or more thereby providing sufficient stability for stacking while optimizing material usage by reducing the presence of the

Art Unit: 3781

rim. Moreover, it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70. Furthermore, a change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. *In re Dailey et al.*, 149 USPQ 47.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F. R. 1.111, including: "The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. A general allegation that the claims "define a patentable invention" without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, "The prompt development of a clear Issue requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims." Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP 2163.06 and MPEP 714.02. The "disclosure" includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.

Art Unit: 3781

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER B. MCKINLEY whose telephone number is (571)272-3370. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

- 11. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Stashick can be reached on (571) 272-4561. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.
- 12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Anthony D Stashick/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3781

/C. B. M./ Examiner, Art Unit 3781